DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 107 TM 800 117

AUTHOR Haberman, Martin
TITLE To Test or Not to Test--That is the Question.
PUB DATE Jun 79
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Parent Teachers Association Conference (83rd, Milwaukee, WI, June 10-13, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Basic Skills; Compensatory Education; Competition; Educational Attitudes; *Educational Testing; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Norm Referenced Tests; Special Education; *Standardized Tests; *Testing Problems; Test Results; Test Validity

ABSTRACT

Arguments in support of standardized testing are critically analyzed. Usual criticisms of such tests are summarized as relatively unimportant. However, two basic criticisms are offered: the competitive nature of scoring standardized tests and their lack of content validity. The test-makers contention that tests are neutral and simply need to be administered by better trained personnel is dismissed as a false argument. Other supports for standardized testing as predictive, guidance and diagnostic instruments are also critized. Links between standardized testing and other trends in education are identified. These movements include compensatory education, accountability, and a narrowing of the school's goals to basic skills. Relationships are drawn between the standardized testing movement and the control of the school curriculum. Essentially, the paper contends that standardized testing directly and indirectly supports antieducational goals. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185107

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

To Test Or Not To Test--That Is The Question

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Martin Haberman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Martin Haberman, Dean
Division of Urban Outreach
U. of Wisconsin Milwaukee
U. of Wisconsin Extension

83rd Annual P.T.A. Convention
June, 1979

TM800 117

Every few months the popular magazines run articles dealing with standardized tests. Magazines aimed at the home and family living have also established this topic as a regular--along with such sure-fire repeaters as dieting and how to cut down on income taxes. The Sunday supplements of most newspapers also include an article or two on testing fairly regularly.*

The popular stuff reflects a bit of caution regarding tests and usually gives tips to parents and students on what questions to raise with school counselors. Essentially, however, tests are accepted as a technological fact--a valid approach to the assessment of human potentiality and educational achievement. The more thoughtful articles raise questions of research findings regarding race and intelligence; they discuss issues of school integration, admission to advanced graduate school based on test scores and more recently the issue of whether or not abilities decline with the aging process.

Much of these popular materials appear to be critical of testing. My reading indicates that they tend to make the following criticisms about tests:

1. Unfair to minorities.
2. Unfair to those not good at taking tests.
3. Unfair to those with different physical makeups, e.g., hyperactive or vision impaired.
4. Unfair to older persons who are slower to react.
5. Unfair to those who are not testwise.
6. Unfair to those lacking interest or motivation for taking the test.
7. Lack of reliability in gain scores; that is, too few items distinguish between grade levels and this number changes from test to test.
8. Poor administration of tests.
9. Bad interpretation of tests.
10. Misuse of tests by admission officers.

---

*Robert J. Solomon, Vice President of Educational Testing Service, reported sales of 79.6 million for 1978. While this is the major company in the industry, it is not the only one. (MILWAUKEE JOURNAL, 1/24/79)

11. Misinterpretations and misuse of tests by teachers.

12. Variations among tests and between even different forms of same tests by the same publisher.

13. Lack of adequate sample populations which account for low ethnic representation.

14. Misuse of tests in legal actions.

15. Negative effects of testing on parents and students.

16. Invalid procedures for comparing gain; e.g., school calendar administration, September to September, rather than June to June.

I am certain I could list another sixteen items and that with your help add another sixteen and another sixteen. Citations on my bibliography include substantial amounts of these criticisms in better form than I am able to offer. While I agree with these criticisms and would probably agree with the ones you add, I would strongly urge that these criticisms be abandoned. These criticisms assume that 1) standardized testing is essentially a valid technology which can and should be improved and 2) that much of the problem resides in the misuse by untrained or unknowledgeable people. I will not fall into these assumptions. I urge you to not be naive and to assume that a better technology is around the corner. A major purpose of this presentation is to emphasize two fundamental flaws in the standardized testing movement which are unanswerable by technocrats, or test publishers. The two issues I will raise deal with construct validity and the concept of competitive knowledge or competitive potential. First, however, I would like to make some connections between trends that I see in American education and how the standardized testing movement supports these essentially negative trends. I am seeking to justify the position that the issue of testing is not a matter apart from the basic changes affecting American education. On the contrary, the changes I see are supported, in fact made possible, by

the testing movement. The four trends that I see revealing themselves and which are made possible by the testing movement are:

1. The increasing disparity of educational opportunity. In the two decades since Conant coined the title, "Slums and Suburbs," the educational breach has widened and solidified into two polarized camps. The education offered the disadvantaged rural and urban poor on the one hand vs. the education offered the middle-class and suburban on the other.

2. The accelerating accountability movement. This includes the drive to assess not only teachers and students but all personnel and programs on a cost/effective basis.

3. The resurgence of the basic education movement with two handmaidens, reading and vocational education. This has resulted and will continue to lead to an ever-narrowing of school curricula to skills development at the expense of broad liberal/general education.

4. An increase in the number of individuals and groups who feel disenchanted, even hostile, to public education and who will manifest their antipathy in many forms of decreased support.

How is the standardized testing movement related to these trends? How does testing contribute to the haves and have nots growing further apart? How does scientific neutral testing contribute to an ever-widening gap between the middle-class and affluent world on the one hand and the poor and minority on the other? The answer to me is clear and suggests a planned effort in non-change which will be highly successful. The connections between the testing movement and the four trends should be considered carefully, for, while these are ideas with which we tend to be familiar, we sometimes miss their interdependence.

In order to forestall new school integrations and in order to prevent older integrations from becoming a genuine sharing of educational opportunities, we have created, or permitted the creation of, compensatory education. Compensatory education is a movement that assumes that services, methods, treatments, equipment, facilities, remediation, or whatever, can be applied to the educationally disadvantaged and that these treatments--rather than a true sharing of equal and integrated facilities--will compensate for their deficiencies. The ultimate proof used by compensatory educators to show that compensatory programs work are test scores. Without standardized test scores, the myth that segregated, unequal education could somehow compensate for prior unequal education could not be perpetrated. Even more outright, honest opponents of equal opportunity say; "Show us the test scores of how learning has been improved by your sociological experimentation." And of course well-intentioned naive people start scurrying around looking for hard data and it isn't there. There are no consistent significant shifts across integrated school systems which can be supported by test scores. The best we can say is that there are no losses for the majority and a range of positive effects which the tests don't assess. But by then it is too late. The debate is lost and over because we acted as if test scores were the critical issue when we went scurrying after them. Not finding them and then claiming virtues which go beyond the tests are too little and too late.

I contend that if there were no standardized tests there could be no compensatory education programs and that these programs not only do not compensate for, but are themselves instrumental in widening the gap between the haves and have-nots. By what means but improved test scores are parents, citizens and educators led to believe that these remarkable compensatory

treatments are effective? In 1970, I reviewed 1,000 Title I project reports and they were all successful. Everyone used a standardized I.Q., or reading, or achievement test to "prove" that their experimental group, i.e., "the disadvantaged" had improved. What amazes me is that there are any disadvantaged left, considering the remarkable success of all the Title I projects--which now number in the thousands and include millions of children. All of them have "proven" they were successful with the hard data of standardized test scores. How is it that everyone who has been reached is cured and we still have the problem? This anomaly would not be available to me were it not for standardized tests. But while I can see the humor in it, be aware of the fact that young people who have been and who are being brutalized by this system of compensation could not have it done to them--sold to them and to their parents--were it not for the technology of tests.

The second use of testing to support a social trend is in the area of accountability. This movement assumes that there is a technology for assessing students' learning and potential and for connecting the results to teacher effectiveness. If we did not believe we could accurately assess students' learnings, we could not believe it were possible to evaluate their teachers based on these learnings. It is only because we believe that standardized tests do validly assess students' growth in learning the initially important subjects, that we can support the growing predisposition to judge teachers by students' scores. I believe an overwhelming majority of the public believes this and that the number will grow.

Teachers are now in the poetically just position of having judged students by these tests and now having the tests applied to themselves.

Suddenly teachers can see all the inequalities of testing. What a quick learning turnabout! School administrators have for years used the test scores to get budgets passed for their "more productive, effective schools." Now that tests are cited as the reason for not passing budgets, the same administrators are asking the public to pay less attention to test scores.

Accountability is already here. In some states, the teachers' associations have even joined the public in seeking written tests for new State licenses. I wonder if we could guess the motivation of such movements.

In addition to compensatory education and accountability, standardized testing supports the move to narrow the goals of American education down to the basic skills. Reading, vocational education and the supposedly "basic" skills have replaced the broad general/liberal education goals formerly espoused. Basic and fundamental educators can point to test scores as measures of their effectiveness. To what can the teacher of scientific method, of theoretic understanding, of poetry, or of citizenship point? To what can the teacher who devotes most time, energy and expertise to the removal of learning blocks and the motivation of youngsters point? There are no reliable, valid measures beyond the basic skills areas. As a result, the basic or fundamental educator supports teaching information which can be tested rather than great ideas which are not amenable to the technology.

The result of this trend is obvious if we consider the stated goals of most public schools. In addition to basic skills and information, they inevitably include:

-A knowledge of principles, concepts, theories in many subject areas.
-Problem-solving abilities, skills of inquiry, scientific method.
-Skills of group living, citizenship, intergroup and human relations.
-Personal health/environmental health.
-Aesthetic development in various arts.
-The development of personal values, ethics, morals.

-A positive self concept.
-Critical judgments of self, others, social situations, ideas.
-Marketable skills.

Now the question is in which of these areas can standardized tests be used? How much of the school curriculum should be devoted to basic skills?

Some argue that the basic skills are prerequisite for learning--the key to achieving all the other objectives. Others argue that reading is the last refuge of those who cannot teach and/who simply assign chapters and then complain that students haven't been sufficiently prepared by the preceding teachers. They play a game called, "There it is, get at it." You write an assignment on the board. Students read and answer questions. The actions of an assignment director and a teacher become synonymous.

My own estimation is that, because most of the goals of the school are broad and beyond our present assessment abilities, we seize on what is measurable. What becomes measurable thereby increases in importance. For example, the skills of math computation become more important than the basic concepts of math because broad basic concepts are not readily assessed with validity and reliability. Similarly, social studies generalizations are ignored in favor of facts about the names of the three branches of government or definitions of latitude and longtitude. But is knowledge of such "facts" knowledge a citizen needs for participation in our society? Similarly, reading comprehension can be tested more reliably than essay writing or other fields of literature and as a result, we test for it. In short, whatever can be tested assumes a disproportionate amount of importance. Given the imponderables, the unanswerable, the complexities and the uncontrollables, the public is desperate for something tangible, something definite, something specific and concrete, and/something that will give us some security that progress is really being realized. In this world,

where we all feel helpless to control critical factors, testing becomes an island of refuge--a place where we can finally see something happening.

Permit me to assure you that I believe basic skills to be one critical component of the school curriculum. But these skills must be seen in perspective and not blown out of proportion because they are all that is readily assessable. (This is the part of my views that critics overlook, so I ask you to bear with me in strict attention.) I would say that standardized tests can measure approximately 15% o the school curriculum. If we use these tests to assess <u>total</u> school programs, or student learnings, or to do research on effectiveness, or to use the scores in the literally hundreds of ways they are now used, we should in all honesty, admit publicly that we are abandoning the broad general/liberal education in favor of skills centers. We could then proceed in a simple minded but straight line. If on the other hand we insist on keeping the rhetoric about the general goals reviewed earlier, we must constantly remind ourselves and everyone else, standardized tests measure only a small part of school curricula.

There are four curricula in schools. First is the level of what is printed in the guides, voiced by the school board and administration, catalogued in the libraries and checked on when the state officials examine the written syllabi. It is the officially-approved curriculum. Second is the teacher's version; that is what is actually taught. Third is the reality or student version--what is actually learned. Fourth and most important is what is tested for. I would contend that it is comparable to a giant bridge game. Testing is spades. What is tested becomes the dominant trump curriculum and drives the other three out of operation. We all know, chapter and verse, how teaching and learning for the tests can take over a school program.

The fourth trend which is supported by the testing movement is the increasing disenchantment with public education. In addition to the taxpayers' groups--who have always been there--we now have constituencies among the elderly who are reacting against what they perceive to be neglect in a youth-oriented culture. They want programs for the older adult and in a period of limited resources they are becoming a group that is often in an adversary relationship to appropriations for children and youth. Various other groups in our society--many of them younger--are also reacting to their perception that education has been oversold to them as a sure-fire avenue into a profession or a meaningful job. The increasing difficulty for gaining public support for education will intensify even further in my judgment.

I believe that if we examine each of the negative components of this trend leading toward disenchantment with public education, we will find standardized tests at work. "Evidence" cited for disaffection inevitably emphasizes lower achievement scores. Groups which "prove" the uselessness of schooling for certain types of people refer to test scores. Conversely, people who claim they did well in school by using test scores show the dysfunctionalism in the system because they cannot get jobs. If high scores don't lead to admission to prestigious professional schools or to important positions, then schools must be inadequate for the advantaged as well as for the disadvantaged. Test scores are used to prove people are unqualified. Test scores are used to prove people are over qualified. Test scores are used to prove universities and employers do not discriminate. Test scores are used to prove they do discriminate. The point is that as we examine the disenchantment of the elderly and various other groups who claim to have

lost confidence in the schools, they inevitably use test scores to frame their arguments.

Critics of my views point out that I am blaming neutral objects, standardized tests, for social/educational evils where tests are merely tools of the misinformed or ineffective. The testers contend that there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the tests. It is only in the misuse of tests by the ill-informed or poorly educated which should command my attention. Testers frequently go on to indicate how well-developed and thoroughly-developed instruments can be administered individually by highly-trained professionals--school psychologists, educational counselors, psychometrists, experts in special and exceptional education who can identify various forms of handicaps in a scientific, objective manner and that these experts using the technology of testing identify handicaps which would otherwise go undetected. There are several responses to those supposedly logical reasons for supporting the testing movement which I would like to present as the basis for opposing testing. I pray that these reasons gain the popularity the ones cited earlier have since they are infinitely stronger. Standardized tests are themselves intrinsically evil and can, therefore, only be used for maleficent purposes. They are not merely neutral objects at all. They are not a technology that can be used for positive purposes by the wise and well-trained. They can only be used for anti-educational purposes by their very nature...and here I refer to all standardized norm-referenced tests of ability and achievement.

First is the issue of competitive knowledge. Achievement tests are composed of items which have been carefully pretested. These items have been selected because they can disperse populations of pre-schoolers, or ninth graders or college graduates into normal distributions. This doesn't mean

that any group who takes a test is normally distributed. It refers to the selection of items to be incorporated on a test by making certain the item will disperse a particular population in a normal manner. When a preschooler or ninth grader or college graduate "does well" on a standardized test, he/she has not simply answered items correctly. He/she has answered questions which someone else could not answer! And this is the ultimate point--one which must never be forgotten! He/she has answered items which an unseen, unknown individual could not answer correctly! Standardized testing is in its nature competitive testing. The scoring reflects a lack of knowledge elsewhere. To be highly intelligent, by definition, requires someone else to be retarded. To be knowledgeable demands stupidity elsewhere. There can be no scores in the abstract. The 95th percentile, or the 50th, the bottom or top halves, septiles, deciles and medians are all comparative assessments.

The philosophy of the testing movement is simple, neat and wrong. Like all simple solutions to complex social issues, it plays on the understandable need for specifics and clarity. But issues of human potential and knowledge are not reality reduced to common sense or to truisms.

Above all else, we must guard against treating knowledge as if it were a competitive commodity. Unlike John Smith's parcel of land which is not to be trespassed because only John Smith can own it, knowledge does not become more or less valuable because it is known by others. Valuable knowledge is not debased by sharing or by communicating or by teaching it. If it were a competitive commodity--as the tests condition us to believe--Chinese would be the least valuable language to learn since it is already debased by so many who can already understand it. Knowledge is not a commodity like gold or wheat. It is a universal good awaiting all. In today's world of scarce fuels and shortages of clean air and water, almost everything has become a

commodity. Economists keep hammering away at the scarcity concept, that is; "everything that is desirable is in short supply--some people will have what large numbers of others will not have." This scarcity concept is peddled by the testers and is commonly accepted in relation to knowledge. Knowledge, in all its forms, however, must be thought of as a common good. In the case of a democratic society, we must assume the reverse of the scarcity concept. The more people know, the better off we all are and the better off we can hope to become. Do we believe with James Madison that "Education is the true foundation of civil liberty" or do we believe the Educational Testing Service that for the top half there must be a bottom half--for every respondent who answers any item correctly there must be a countervailing ignorance? Knowledge is not a product to be owned by some and kept away from the others. Neither is it to be used by the pernicious who declare this is a dog-eat-dog world, nor by the addled that life is a football game where not all can win, nor by the world-of-hard-knockers who proclaim the best preparation for a rotten world is character building and harshtreatment and/low test scores, therefore, are a form of pedagogy. who say

When you discuss these issues, do not be led into the trap of discussing minorities, or unfairness, or administrative issues. Stay on this one point and insist--demand--an explanation. Why must human potential be assessed in relative terms? Why must human knowledge be assessed in relative terms?

Testmakers cannot answer these questions because, like the rest of us, they do not know what human potential, or I.Q., or even knowledge in its myriad forms, is. They try to make the best of a bad bargain; that is, not knowing what these qualities are, they can compare us to each other on items that appear to be samples of these qualities. This leads us to the second reason why, after competitive knowledge, standardized tests are inherently

evil and not simply neutral objects which are misused. Standardized tests assess items of information which have been pretested as reliable in dispersing populations of six-year olds, or nine-year olds, or college graduates. They do not assess knowledge that all citizens need, or that job-holders need. They do not assess knowledge because the basic technology of testing is built upon the cumulation of items, while knowledge in all disciplines of subject matter exists on a more general, abstract, conceptual level than the informational level. Knowing what two colors to mix to make a third is art information--not artistic knowledge. Similarly, with defining an etude! It is music information not music knowledge. Defining, identifying, locating, matching or whatever with math words, science words, or pictures of things/ is merely information. Test items are on an information level which <u>assumes</u> they reflect knowledge. As soon as tests move away from the informational level and try to assess more general forms of knowing, they drop significantly in their reliability. Testing is a technology of item testing on a comparative basis: we should not assume that the items add up to anything. If I produce an individual who has memorized the Philadelphia Telephone Directory and tell you he is the most brilliant individual alive, you would ask; "What leads you to assume that all the bits and pieces he knows add up to anything? What does he know that is supposed to be a sample of real knowledge?" Who are the experts who claim the Philadelphia Directory is representative of a body of important, necessary knowledge? Who are the experts who claim that knowing the Philadelphia Telephone Directory is predictive of human intelligence? Who cares about the scores of others who only know half of the Philadelphia Directory? If these questions sound ridiculous, they are so intended.

Why don't we ask these questions of the testmakers? There are several reasons we do not:

1. Most people believe information is knowledge. The popularity of quiz shows and newspaper tests is merely indicative. The cliché "you better not generalize" is even common among college students who have been conditioned to regard isolated facts as valuable truth in place of general concepts which can be connected into principles and theories.

2. In addition to confusing information with knowledge, we have been led to believe that experts exist who actually know which informational facts can represent a knowledge of math, which pieces of language represent human intelligence, which comparison or analogy items will predict who will make the highest advanced scholar. We are coming to question experts in many areas but the testers are still safe, because

3. Most people are inadequate in statistical reading. Against the barrage from the testmakers, we respond with awe when we should challenge. If we have crud, and most information is when compared to knowledge, it doesn't matter how we qualify it nor how sophisticated the statistical pyrotechnics. It remains crud.

Knowledge is not information. Knowledge is not limited to a small portion of the few subjects studied in schools which can be objectified. Knowledge is boundless and growing. Human potential is unknown--perhaps unfathomable. Faced with these infinities, the testmakers ask us the capital of Montana and then compare us by age. Emboldened by the great rewards for trivializing human knowledge and putting it on a competitive basis, they do the same with human potentialities. We can't assess human intelligence, but we can ask you to point to green and note the time it takes.

The increasing use and respect afforded the testers sometimes gives me pause to reconsider if I am wrong for regarding the standardized tests as straight from Alice in Wonderland. I am frequently motivated to recheck new versions of tests that I have missed and, sure enough, they are unchanged. A knowledge of words is still used as the basis for scoring human intelligence. Vocabulary is synonymous with human intelligence. Who are the idiots, imbeciles, retarded? Are they the people identified by the testers, or the people with several college degrees who can believe that word knowledge and the ability to match some shapes measures human intelligence?

In sum, the tests--whether achievement or intelligence--have no construct validity. Who says that the items which are labelled mathematics actually assess mathematics? Similarly, for science, music, or occupational preference. Because they cannot secure agreement among experts about what knowledge is of most worth, testers push us into their competitive game. They tell us who doesn't know the trivia. We should be overjoyed and rewarded if we do know the trivia. And some of us are so overjoyed we form exclusive clubs.

If we were to drive the testers into a corner with those arguments, they would still make three claims:

1. The standardized tests predict school success;
2. The tests can be used for guidance purposes;
3. The tests are needed in exceptional or special education.

My responses to these claims are that they don't make any sense. Let's consider them. First, the tests predict school success. Many teachers shape their expectations of students on the basis of the test scores. There is a well-known self-fulfilling prophesy that takes hold of the learning process.

If low scorers have teachers who then expect more or less of them, should we credit the tests with being predictive or should we worry about the influence the tests are having on the teachers' perceptions of students' abilities? Further, teachers do not want to be judged on the basis of test scores. They respond by teaching for the tests. A circular set of conditions becomes operative. The content on the tests becomes the dominant curriculum and not simply an assessment of a sample of the curriculum. How can testers claim their tests predict school success when we now have a situation in which the tests--readiness, reading, achievement, or whatever, are now the major purpose of instruction. To claim that standardized tests predict who will be successful in school is, in effect, to claim that test scores will predict test scores since how else is success measured?

The second argument of the testers, after the great predictive one, is that tests are essential for guidance purposes. I would argue the reverse. If guidance is to become a useful school service, it must help individuals to overcome and ignore their test results. It is a dangerous, erroneous pastime to give individuals specific advice about what they should and should not do based on test scores. It has become an occupational disease of too many school counselors and school psychologists to make restrictive predictions about what a particular student can do, should do, cannot do, and should not do. All of us can give examples from among ourselves, our friends, our families and our students who have gone on to successful life/work/educational experiences by ignoring and by even flying in the face of predictions based on tests. More sadly and more frequently, however, we all have examples of how individuals never developed their potentials because they believed the test analyses given them by some supposed expert. I believe more human potential has remained latent, been nipped in the bud,

been shoved in the wrong direction, or relegated to the scrap heap by believing in the predictive validity of tests than by other forms of miseducation we have practiced.

We also know that happy, successful, productive people change jobs--particularly when they are young. We also know that many, perhaps most, successful people do not decide at an early age on a particular life work and stay on that single track. The use of tests for educational/vocational guidance goes in the exact opposite of this knowledge by trying to make more and more youngsters make earlier and earlier choices. The testing movement, in effect, has become the vehicle for closing down people's perceptions of their life options. The last two people I met who were happy at their work were a man who arranges flowers at dog shows and a man who arranges patterns with dominoes--when they topple it takes as much as several minutes and they fall in interesting designs! Can you imagine a school guidance counselor helping these two men as youths to interpret their standardized test scores and "build their careers accordingly?" These are not isolated instances. In my judgment, an overwhelming majority of our people get where they are in spite of, not because of, school guidance.

Finally, the test makers are driven to their last refuge. The diagnosis and treatment of the exceptional, the special, the handicapped student. If ever a field suffered from a chronic overdosage of "testitis," it is exceptional education! There are tests for everything imaginable, most of which could be observed by eyeball and without formal higher education. No field, with the possible exception of reading, suffers as much from the belief that a technology of diagnosis--based on standardized testing--will solve their problems as the field of exceptional education. They have substituted a search for technocracy for basic human needs of love, support

and communication. Perhaps driven to be respectable in "researchy" graduate schools; perhaps driven by the demands for cost/effectiveness in government grants; perhaps influenced by the health personnel they often work with; perhaps driven by the legal needs to protect themselves against lawsuits; perhaps misguided by the naive assumption that an accurate test will give them a clue for some treatment, the fields of exceptionality are in the lap of the testers. As a result, they have input overload; that is, by constant testing and diagnosing, they have more information than they know what to do with. Fortunately since most of the data is test data, it is good that they can't implement it. Next time you meet an Exceptional Education Expert in any field of exceptionality, ask him to describe one of his students. Then ask him how he would teach that student to distinguish between "there" and "where." You will be amazed by the responses. You may find, as I have, that the half-dozen strategies of teaching are the same for all children and the tests are necessary only to provide work to maintain the professors, the specialists in the public schools, the experts in the State departments and the grant givers in Washington. It is, as all fields based on testing, a house of cards.

If I could sum up, I would not have gone through this lengthy review. Permit me to close with a final plea in behalf of knowledge. The most pedestrian minds of our age know more facts, have more information than Isaac Newton. Do they have more knowledge? Many elementary school children today have more facts than Socrates had, do you really believe they know more? As educators, we have a responsibility to stand for knowledge and to fight the testmongers who would trivialize our intellectual heritage. The price of humankind's potential, the value of our general/liberal understandings,

the importance of our collective, not competitive wisdom, must surely be higher than a machine-scored test.

When it comes to knowledge in a democratic society, I truly am my brother's keeper--and my sister's keeper. What choice do I have? Can I learn to preserve the environment but ignore how my fellows treat it? Can I vote for honest people and ignore my fellows? Can I secure justice for myself and ignore how others are fairing? The truth is we need each other. We need the very best in each other. We need to have our collective and our individual potentialities developed to the fullest. Competition, or each doing his/her "own thing" will not be an adequate response for meeting the challenges of the future.

Rabbi Hillel once said, "If I'm not for myself, who am I? But if I'm only for myself, what am I? If not now, when?"

Are you willing to stand up and join me? Are you willing to say to them, "We are not only for ourselves. And now, we have had enough, enough, now, we have had enough."